

CANDOUR

*The British
Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 39, No 9

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

September, 1988

WILL DUKAKIS BOMB SOUTH AFRICA?

by PAT BUCHANAN

PRESSED by Jesse Jackson as to whether he would use "military force" against South Africa, including the "use of bombs inside South Africa," Michael Dukakis left the door wide open. "Well, I've laid out that policy, Jesse, and yes, one aspect of a tough anti-terrorist policy is the use of military force against terrorist base camps. But there are many ways to attack terrorism, and one way to do it is to get tough on South Africa, and that means the United States leading the effort to make that an international boycott...."

Well, if we are to awaken some morning in 1989 to learn that U.S. carrier-based F-18s have been hammering suspected RENAMO camps in the Transvaal, an act of war against a country said to possess nuclear weapons, Candidate Dukakis ought to let us know, now, exactly what he has in mind.

This idiocy, that the U.S. align itself militarily with the bankrupt, corrupt Marxist regimes of southern Africa, against South Africa, has now gone far beyond liberal fantasizing. Jesse Jackson is insisting the Democratic platform brand South Africa "a terrorist state" and is clamouring for U.S. military aid to Zimbabwe and Mozambique. Late in May he was joined by **The New York Times** which, in the giddiness of the summit, endorsed a Washington-Moscow axis "to tell Pretoria what the world thinks of destabilisation and apartheid." If ever there was a manifestation of collective mental illness, surely this hare-brained scheme is it.

Like a pair of house cats unable to distinguish between a noisy neighbourhood puppy and a silent killer-Doberman, the **Times** has lost the capacity to differentiate between flawed friend [sic] and strategic enemy. Lest we forget: the Soviet Union has 10,000 nuclear warheads aimed at the United States. Moscow is de-stabilising Central America, constructing a subversive base camp in Nicaragua; while South Africa is holding the Soviet Empire and its surrogates at bay in Angola. What, in God's name, has South Africa ever done to the United States to justify Dukakis considering air strikes against that beleaguered country?

In his increasingly bold statements that communism is no longer America's enemy, but apartheid is, Jesse Jackson speaks for an ever-increasing segment of the American Left; and he is dragging the Democratic Party leftward with him. Indeed, in the struggle for the future being waged in Africa and Latin America, Jackson is dragging Dukakis over onto the Communist side. Friendly to both Castro and Ortega, Jackson is openly supportive of Dos Santos in Angola and "Comrade Bob" Mugabe in Zimbabwe. He wants the Contras and UNITA jettisoned, Marxist Angola recognised, Mozambique and Zimbabwe provided with U.S. weapons, and South Africa declared a terrorist state against which the U.S. Navy is to make bombing runs. And evidently his lightweight friend

Dukakis is going right along with him.

As I have written before, this implacable hostility to the Boer Republic is not rooted in any abiding love for the black people of Crossroads or Soweto, but in an all-consuming hatred of the white ruling class in South Africa. That hatred, pressed upon a Congress terrified and intimidated by any charge that it is "soft on racism" is driving the U.S. into one blunder after another. Imposing sanctions over the president's veto, Congress produced precisely the consequences predicted: U.S. firms sold out, black jobs were wiped out, social programmes were abandoned.

Before Congress plunges ahead, Americans should reflect on a U.S. Bureau of Mines report that the proposed ban on South African minerals will cost the U.S. economy near \$2 billion and jeopardise 4,000 U.S. jobs. Why do it? Existing sanctions have already increased U.S. dependence on Soviet Europe for vital minerals. But then, buying from Leninists is apparently less of a moral embarrassment than buying from segregationists.

The Price Of Revolution

Much of this now routine beating up of South Africa is done for the most contemptible of motives: to pander to Jesse Jackson, to buff one's credentials as a "fighter for human rights," to suck up to Moscow, to serve as a cheap substitute for standing up to America's real enemies. If the American Left wants a crusade on behalf of suffering black people, perhaps the proposal of William Pascoe of Heritage Foundation will find merit. Given that Gorbachev's man in Ethiopia, Colonel Mengistu, has now set about starving to death three million people in Eritrea and Tigre provinces, to crush their rebellion as Stalin crushed the rebellious Ukraine, why not an American cut-off of aid to Ethiopia, the imposition of Western sanctions, and military assistance to the rebels to rid Africa of the most odious tyrant the Third World has produced since Pol Pot?

At the 11th annual TransAfrica dinner recently, where "Bring Back Nelson Mandela" was the hit tune, ailing T.V. anchor Max Robinson arrived wearing The Order of African Redemption given him in 1972 by Liberian President William Tolbert. Five years earlier, I too met then-Vice President Tolbert in Monrovia. Gregarious, friendly, pro-American like his Cabinet, he was a delightful host. If memory serves they threw his body into a roadside ditch; and his Cabinet ended up tied to stakes on the beach, being executed one by one to the cheers of the mob. Before Mr Dukakis puts the United States on the side of Marxist revolution in South Africa, he might reflect a moment on what D.W. Brogan called "the price of revolution."

SHE WHO MUST BE OBEYED? - According to the **Jewish Chronicle** (29/7/88), the White House will have a Jewish First Lady for the first time if the Democrats win in November, while a recent **International Herald Tribune** piece, examining some of the political implications of Kitty Dukakis, claims her "passionate identification with Israel has raised hopes in Israel and questions in the Arab world." Mr Dukakis' "Princess" is said to "wear the pants" at home, being "assertive and arrogant." Like as not she will speak her mind and assert her will on her husband's policy decisions if elected President - and he'd better be listening!

TUTU, THE SOAPBOX RANTER

ARCHBISHOP Desmond Tutu paid a flying visit to Petersfield (only five miles from Forest House!) on July 9th to "preach" at St Peter's Church. The hypocrisy of this "emotionally moving occasion," to quote the parish magazine, was pointed out by Patrick Lamport in an excellent letter published in the **Petersfield Post** under this heading:

Let Tutu take up a soapbox in the Square

"WITH regard to the visit of Archbishop Tutu to this town, it would be as well to know what the reality is behind his political rantings. He repeatedly urges our Government to impose sanctions upon South Africa, in spite of the fact that this would mean suffering and hardship for so many, especially the black population. The Archbishop does not mention the tyranny that now exists in Zimbabwe, the detentions without trial in Zambia, or indeed any of the brutality that prevails in the black African dictatorships. Nor does he tell us of the thousands that seek refuge every year in South Africa from the oppression of neighbouring states; also the fact that South Africa is feeding the rest of Africa, as the other countries are so rife with corruption that their agricultural and financial systems are in a state of chaos.

"Of course, those who are urging sanctions are really working for a complete breakdown in the government of South Africa, with all the disaster and misery that this would entail. The terrorists would then take over, and all Africa would come under communist control. Their real aim is possession of the vital trade routes, and the valuable mineral deposits of the country.

"If Archbishop Tutu wishes to spread his political propaganda in this town, let him speak from a soapbox in the Square where one can answer him back, and not have the hypocrisy to hide it under a cloak of religion from the pulpit. I do not want this evil man in Petersfield."

*

*

*

*

The following week this was published from the Editor of **Candour**:

"CONCERNING the political and economic disasters in Southern Africa currently termed 'Front Line States,' and the likely results of a South African governmental surrender to them and the Christian-Aided demagogues who purport to rule them, there is little to add to Mr Lamport's expose in your issue of July 6, except perhaps to remind Tutu's temporary congregation of some of the arch-pharisee's more edifying, unrefuted remarks made on other 'moving occasions':

"'One young man with a stone in his hands can achieve far more than I can with a dozen sermons' (**Daily Telegraph**, November 1984). 'Imagine what would happen if only 30 per cent of domestic servants in white households would poison their employers' food' (**Volkskrant**, Holland, 15 November 1984). 'Thank God I am black. White people will have a lot to answer for at the Last Judgement' (**Argus**, South Africa, 19 March 1984).

"Taking into account the biblical forecast on the fate of self-proclaimed 'not as other men,' perhaps it is our Christian duty to pray for all sinners, not just white ones."

CUT AND THRUST

by JANUS

MANY people may find themselves confused about the prospect of fuller integration with Europe in 1992. It is all quite simple. When we are in Europe we shall be able to sell goods to the other members of the EEC (the fact that we already sell goods can be ignored). The foreigners will not be such rotters as to sell their goods to us, thus ruining the balance of payments (they already do, but ignore that). Countries which remain outside the EEC will be ruined economically (it is a known fact that Sweden and Switzerland, for instance, are almost bankrupt, with grass growing in the streets and people starving). A comparatively small, overcrowded island situated near a continent cannot hope to survive (the fact that Japan, a comparatively small etc. island seems to have so much money that it doesn't know what to do with it is neither here nor there: this is merely an example of Oriental cunning and duplicity). Finally, a united Europe will be able to match the industrial might of the USA (the fact that the Americans have been urging us for years to join Europe is obviously proof of the highminded and selfless nature of American governments).

FORTY-ONE people died of suffocation in an overcrowded prison van as they were being transferred to jail during student riots in March. Had this happened in South Africa the whole world would have resounded with cries of indignation and Sir Richard Attenborough would probably have considered making yet another film. As it occurred in 'Third World' Burma, nothing much was said. I wonder why.

VIRAJ Mendis, a Sinhalese from "Sri Lanka", came to this country in 1973 as a 17-year-old student. He should have returned home after two years when his permit expired; instead he stayed on - and on. In 1986 a deportation order was issued but Mendis, with great presence of mind, sought refuge in the bosom of the Church - literally. He has stayed in the Church of the Ascension, Hulme, ever since, supported by the Mendis Defence Campaign. As he is a Communist who supports the Tamils he believes that he will be seen as a traitor and is in fear of his life. I would have thought that after fifteen years he'd have been forgotten in Sri Lanka but perhaps they have long memories there. There are two possible solutions to the problem: as he is a Communist he could go to Russia; as he is a Tamil supporter he could go to southern India, where the majority of Tamils live. But perhaps the Russians and the Indians don't want him either!

ACCORDING to an article in the **Telegraph** of 26th June, possibly thousands of illegal immigrants are sneaking into the UK along the East Anglian coast each year. As the number of immigration staff has dropped by a third in the past ten years while the traffic has more than doubled, this isn't surprising, especially as the Suffolk police have just one launch with which to investigate suspicious craft. Maybe the introduction of identity cards might not be a bad thing if it led to the discovery and deportation of illegal immigrants. On the other hand, all that would happen would be that all the churches, chapels and cathedrals would be full of such interlopers seeking sanctuary. Religious services would perforce be held in the churchyard or, if wet, in the hall.

A TEENAGER battered his 61-year-old aunt with a billiard cue and then

strangled her with a dog chain (manslaughter - 5 years). A civil servant shot his wife in order, claimed the prosecution, to pay off his £50,000 debts with her insurance money; he claimed it was an accident (manslaughter - 7 years). What does one have to do actually to commit murder nowadays? Today Dr Crippen would have been given two years suspended sentence, although he might have got into trouble for digging up the floor of his cellar (where he interred his late wife) without planning permission.

THERE are millionaires in Russia, it has been revealed in the Russian unions' newspaper **Trud**, but no one knows who they are because Soviet bankers are as secretive as the Swiss. "We read all about millionaires like Rockefeller, but there are those also here in Russia," the report said. "Glasnost must apply also to the banks so that we know who has the money in Russia." I suppose they have to be careful because if we knew who had the money in Russia, some inconvenient person may then want to know who has the money in England or America or Switzerland. Think how awkward it might be when the answer came back that they were all "survivors"!

I WAS amused when the National Union of Teachers issued their solemn complaint and protest about the rising epidemic of violence against teachers and general indiscipline in schools. Well, the NUT would be quite blameless in this sphere, wouldn't they? On the short-list of those to whom they allocated blame were the police, who were alleged to have been far too inert and seemingly reluctant to spring into action. Of course, we're supposed to have short memories, but surely wasn't it the NUT members who not so long ago, in more than one school, demanded a ban on police entry to school premises? If I were a local police chief in a situation where "no go" was the policy, "no go" it would be in any circumstances.

AN Anglican bishop from Africa won the argument at the Lambeth Conference that polygamy is not inconsistent with Christianity and the media treated it as something new. Don't they realise that the Anglican Church already recognises polygamy, and here in England? Only it is called divorce.

HAVE you been glancing at the degree class lists for our various universities this summer, as published in the "quality" press? Sometimes they can resemble telephone directories and I can't help thinking why so much valuable space is given over to them. Sometimes, however, they can be quite enlightening. This was the complete list, according to **The Scotsman**, of candidates achieving first class honours in the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Strathclyde University: Chan Wan Soi, Chung Siong Khin, Chou Siaw Meng, Kenneth William Dalgarno, Foo Kok Seng, Koh Mui Hau, Lim Soy Seng, Alastair Campbell McArthur, Joseph Ng Lee Kiang, Tay Eng Huat, Tee Song Jue, Too Chor Chye, Barbara Anne Tolson, Yap Wee Khoon. I am sure they all deserve congratulations, but can you really imagine the countries of the Far East opening up their universities to Westerners in as generous a manner?

WITH all the Armada celebrations going on at the moment, it occurred to me whether our second sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth, when called upon to address the assembled troops to defend the European Community, would say: "Though I have the body of a weak and feeble woman, I have the heart and kidneys of a pig, and of a Danish pig too!"

ALICE IS AT IT AGAIN!

by NOEL HUNT

THIS line from one of Noel Coward's tuneful songs came to mind when reading a recent press report. This report stated that someone described as "a United Nations negotiator" had asked all Afghan political groups to unite in forming a government. He wanted them to form a "consensus" so as to "provide a government acceptable to all".

Now where, one wonders, have we heard this before? To the casual reader the proposal seems unexceptional and a good idea. A government in which all shades of opinion are represented - what could be more moderate, more "democratic", more statesmanlike? Nothing, it would seem, could possibly give the new state a better start in political life than such a "consensus". At this point memory told us where we had heard this siren song before. Anyone who thinks on these lines is not only naive but has a short memory. Schemes and proposals for such a "consensus" have been touted in previous political situations. Whenever they have been accepted they have proved disastrous to the West. The proposal for a "consensus" has always had the eager support of both Britain and America, and always with the promise that the installation of an all-party government will lead to freedom, justice, democracy and a host of other good things. Unfortunately, matters never work out in that way. Since all shades of opinion must be included in this "consensus" government, then of course the Communists must be represented. It would be "undemocratic" to exclude them, and Britain and America would lead the outcry against such an outrageous proposal. We know this since they have done it before.

Red Takeover

The result is always the same: since Communists are by far the best trained, the best organised and the best advised, forming the most lavishly funded group, and since they are by far the most ruthless, sooner rather than later the "consensus" ends in a Communist takeover. Another satrapy is added to the Soviet Empire. Each time this happens British and American politicians and their media, who have eagerly supported the "consensus", profess to be surprised and dismayed at what has happened. Since it always happens that the result of taking their advice is a Communist takeover, they must be the most frequently and permanently surprised group of men in the world.

A great many people belong to what has been unkindly but accurately described as the "village idiot" school of history. This believes that events "just happen" more or less of themselves. Their opponents hold that on the contrary things happen because a few men, who know precisely what they are about, make them happen. In making these things happen they have world-wide support and at the highest levels. Suggestions for a "broadly based government" always sound good to the "village idiots". Like Western politicians, they never learn from experience. Yet the evidence of the fatal results of "consensus" politics is plain enough if they will but see it.

The case of China is instructive. China was once ruled by Chiang Kai-Shek and his Nationalist party. Chiang had his faults, no doubt, but he was staunchly pro-Western. He was also strongly anti-Communist. So it

just happened that suddenly all the politicians in the West, not to mention the media, discovered that Chiang's government was intolerably corrupt, undemocratic and generally reprehensible. The bad giant Chiang was fearlessly and selflessly opposed, we were told, by that noble fairy Mao Tse-tung, who was driven only by the noblest of motives and a boundless love of "democracy". Between them, the politicians and the media managed to make so much fuss that Chiang was hounded out of mainland China into Taiwan. This enabled Mao to take over and at the cost of millions of lives he imposed Communism on China, which is still enslaved to this day.

The Cuban Heel

Those who may think Britain and America learned a lesson from the case of China are wrong. By way of proof, look at Cuba. That island was ruled by one Batista. He ran what was suddenly found to be a "dictatorship". Anyone who looks dispassionately at the past history and the racial make-up of the population of Cuba may well wonder in what other way such a multi-racial catastrophe could be governed. Batista added to his unpopularity by being pro-Western and anti-Communist. He was consistently castigated, denigrated and execrated in the media of the West. Batista's leading opponent was Fidel Castro, who was depicted throughout the West as a gentle, idealistic and honourable man, an "agrarian reformer" and nothing more. Those sufficiently tactless to point out that he was also a member of the Communist party were quite rightly ignored.

An intensive campaign led to the collapse of the pro-Western Batista government and its replacement by one headed by Castro. He wasted little time on "agrarian reform". What he did was to set about turning Cuba, at enormous cost in human lives, into a Communist fief. It remains one to this day. The Western politicians and media who had ardently campaigned to place the "agrarian reformer" in power were amazed when Castro turned Cuba into a Communist state. They all said so, which of course settles the matter.

If further proof is needed, just look at the cases of South Vietnam or Rhodesia or Nicaragua. So when one reads of the suggestion of the United Nations mediator for a consensus government for Afghanistan, one cannot help feeling that "Alice is at it again". We may be sure that the proposal will be welcomed by all the meddling busybodies who interfere in the affairs of other countries. So perhaps Afghanistan will not prove to be such a Russian disaster as at first thought. They have left behind a few cells of Afghan Communists. Some of these will, with the support of "world opinion", have to be included in the consensus government now mooted. There will be millions of pounds of Western aid. Then sooner or later history will repeat itself and there will be yet another Communist takeover.

This will suit the Soviets admirably. Such an event would more than justify the cost in treasure and Russian lives expended in the Afghan campaign. Nor will the enormous number of deaths, which will take place as the Communists strengthen their grip, worry the Kremlin in the slightest. The cause of Socialism will have been advanced and another province added to the Red Empire. To attain such a prize, human misery means nothing. Lenin meant every chilling word when he wrote: "What does it matter if three-quarters of the human race perish, if the remaining quarter is Communist?"

MORE ON THAT INGLORIOUS REVOLUTION

"LAST week's farrago in Westminster Hall inspires me to protest against the celebrations of the 300th anniversary of the 'Glorious and Bloodless Revolution' of 1688. 1688 was one of the most shameful episodes in British history, when a lawful king was driven from his throne and betrayed by his family and friends because he wanted religious liberty for all. King James expressed his attitude well when he said: 'I hear our Saviour whipped men out of the Temple, but I never heard that he whipped men into it.'

"What deserved shame would have attached itself to the English Catholics if they had betrayed their Sovereign in 1588, as the Protestant 'patriots' did in 1688? And yet there were able Protestants who stayed loyal to their Catholic King - Lord Ailesbury, the Huguenot Feversham, and the Anglican non-jurors to name a few. What took place in 1688 was a transfer of power from an anointed king to an all-powerful and unrepresentative Parliament, which then, as now, put its own interests and privileges first. Love of money was the religion of the 'patriot' of 1688 - as it is of his successor, the 'Thatcherite' of 1988.

"To say that what was done was done to serve Protestantism is another lie that needs to be nailed. Protestantism stood in no danger from James II - at least the King's friend William Penn the Quaker does not seem to have felt himself to be in any danger. But then, Quakers did not have the same vested interests in the establishment as did the Anglican hierarchy. If you say the revolution was bloodless, look across the water at Northern Ireland and see the murder and mayhem being committed there now, largely as a result of the Inglorious Treason of 1688.

G. BRADLEY, Southsea, Hants (**Daily Telegraph**, 25/7/88)

TAKE BRITISH ACTION

"SPEND! Spend! Spend!" urge the banks and finance houses and credit card companies. The result? "A young soldier and his wife of 18 months died in each other's arms in a suicide pact after a bank allowed them to run up debts of more than £17,000 which they had no hope of paying back, a coroner told an inquest yesterday" (**Daily Telegraph**, 18/8/88).

Drive home to the usurers the immorality of their actions! Make your target for British Action this month the distribution of as many USURY CAN DAMAGE YOUR WEALTH stickers as you can. Available from Candour Publishing Co. in self-adhesive rolls at £3.50 for 250.

British Action, incidentally, is not a new organisation. There is no leader, no council, no membership. N.F. and B.N.P. members needn't fear they are being poached away! Our stickers and posters are designed to provide aid and sustenance to the individual patriot who wants to perform some service for his/her country by taking British action.

Read **SPEARHEAD**. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Send 63p. for a sample copy to P.O. Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

NEW SECOND-HAND SALES LIST. Send 2x13p stamps to Candour Research Dept.

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England. (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle)